



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/621,934	07/17/2003	Paul Anthony Ashley	AUS920020639US1	3072
63400	7590	12/19/2007		
IBM CORP. (DHJ) c/o DAVID H. JUDSON 15950 DALLAS PARKWAY SUITE 225 DALLAS, TX 75248			EXAMINER HUSSAIN, TAUQIR	
			ART UNIT 2152	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 12/19/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/621,934

Applicant(s)

ASHLEY ET AL.

Examiner

Tauqir Hussain

Art Unit

2152

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 October 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This office action is in response to amendment /reconsideration filed on 10/18/2007, the amendment/reconsideration has been considered. Claims 1-27 are pending for examination, the rejection cited as stated below.
2. The text of those sections of Title 35 U.S.C 102 and 103(a) not included in this action can be found in a prior Office Action.
3. Grantges, Rathbun and Datar have been cited as prior arts in the last office action. The teachings that applicable are respectfully maintained and incorporated by reference as set forth in the last office action.
4. Claims 1-27, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grantges, Jr. (Patent No.: US 6,324,648 B1), hereinafter "Grant" in view of Datar et al. (Patent No.: US 6,351,812 B1), hereinafter "Datar and further in view of Rathbun et al. (Pub. No.: US 2003/0005308 A1), hereinafter "Rathbun".

Response to Arguments

5. Claims 1, 10 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C 112, 2nd paragraph, however applicant's arguments deemed persuasive and therefore Examiner withdraw the rejection.

6. Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C 112, 1st paragraph, however applicant's arguments deemed persuasive and therefore Examiner withdraw the rejection.
7. Claims 19-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C 101 and maintained by examiner as applicant's argument deemed not persuasive.
8. Applicant's arguments filed on 10/18/2007 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive. In the remarks, applicant argued in substance that
 - (a) Grantges, Datar and Rathbun does not teach, "proxy server filtering of a cookie that is being returned from a server to a client, let alone per-domain cookie filtering".
 - (b) Applicant argues that there is no motivation in combining the teachings of Grantges with the teachings of Datar as there is no relevance to claimed subject matter.
 - (c) Rathbun does not teach, "processing the cookie" in accordance with the "retrieved set of parameters and extracted domain identifier".
 - (d) Applicant argues that cited arts does not disclose, "step of blocking the cookie from transmission, caching the cookie at the proxy and sending a modified response message to client".

As to point (a), Grantges teaches, proxy server parses and modifies the cookie in response to the message from authorization server and based on response of the

authorization server, a gateway proxy server obtains an user ID which includes which applications user can have access to, it can be seen that adding application to which runs on specific servers are created by adding a header information string (e.g. any URL will contain a domain identifier and replacing the domain identifier means extracting the domain identifier) which is described on Col.10, lines 48-54 which is per-domain parsing or filtering and details of this process can be found in (Grantges, Fig.1, Fig.5, Col.9, lines 9-18). Examiner would like to point out that applicant is bringing the term "Filtering" which has not been found, anywhere in the claim language, however examiner believes the terms, "extracting, retrieving, parsing" are within the scope of term used as "filtering" in remarks. Further analyzing the Fig.1 and Fig.7 it will be an obvious variation for one ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to arrange the disclosed components in many different ways to obtain the same end product.

As to argument (b) the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

As to argument (c) Examiner cites (Rathbun, Fig.1, retrieve and decode cookie-24, compare credential to security expression-26) alone describes the above mentioned

limitations just to name few, decoding cookie means retrieving parameters and comparing means processing the cookie in accordance to retrieved parameter.

As to argument (d) Examiner cites (Datar, Col.3, lines 48-50, where identifying the status of cookie as revoked means client will obviously get some error message from the server and further caching of the cookie and redirecting the response to different server and client can be found in Datar reference (Datar, Col.3, lines 63-67 and Col.4, lines 1-10 also Col.4, lines 16-22).

9. Argument to rest of the dependent claims are covered in section a, b, c and d above and further details can be found in the last office action.

10. Any remark, which is not in claimed language, is not being considered by Examiner.

11. **Examiner's Note:** Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references, as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant.

Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in its entirety as potentially teaching of all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tauqir Hussain whose telephone number is 571-270-1247. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on 571 272 3913. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.


Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Application/Control Number:
10/621,934
Art Unit: 2152

Page 7

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

TH
12/15/2007


BUNJOE JAROENCHONWANIT
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
12/18/7